

Appln. No. 10/719,239
Amendment dated June 13, 2006
Reply to Office Action mailed April 3, 2006

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Entry of the above amendments is courteously requested in order to place all claims in this application in allowable condition and/or to place the non-allowed claims in better condition for consideration on appeal.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 through 9, 12, 14, and 16 through 18, 20 and 21 remain in this application. Claims 3, 6, 10, 11, 13, 15 and 19 have been cancelled. No claims are currently withdrawn. Claim 22 has been added.

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action

Claims 6 through 12 and 14 have been objected to for the informalities noted in the Office Action.

Claims 6 through 12 and 14 have been amended in a manner believed to clarify any double recitation in the language.

Withdrawal of the objection to claims 6 through 12 and 14 is therefore respectfully requested.

Paragraphs through 8 of the Office Action

Claims 1, 2, 4, 16 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Bracewell.

Claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bracewell.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the requirements of claim 3, which was indicated as being allowable over the art, and therefore claim 1, as well as the claims that depend from claim 1, are submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Appln. No. 10/719,239
Amendment dated June 13, 2006
Reply to Office Action mailed April 3, 2006

Claim 5 has been rewritten to include the requirements of claim 1, and therefore claim 5, as well as the claims that depend from claim 5, are submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the §102(b) and §103(a) rejections of claims 1, 2, 4, 16, 17 and 18 is therefore respectfully requested.

Added Claim

Added claim 22 include the same requirements as claim 1, with the exception of the last clause, which has been changed to "a height adjustment structure configured to permit adjustment of a height of said second horizontal support member to adjust a distance between said second horizontal support member and said arm member" to vary the scope from the "means for adjusting a height of said second horizontal support" recited in claim 1. It is submitted that this new claim can be allowed without further search or consideration, and an indication to that effect is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.



Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)
Customer No. 40,158
P.O. Box 5027
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027
(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357

Date:

JUNE 13, 2006